

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated December 11, 2003, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 11, 2003. Claims 1-17 and 19-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1-12, 14, 16 and 23 have been allowed. Claims 13, 15 and 19-20 have been amended to more clearly recite aspects of the invention. Applicant believes no new matter has been introduced by the amendments and the new claims presented herein. The amendments have been made in a good faith effort to advance prosecution on the merits. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claim 15 stands objected to since the term "processing system" lacks antecedent basis. Claims 19-22 stand objected to for depending from cancelled claim 18. The Examiner indicated that claims 15 and 19-22 would be allowable if amended to overcome the objections above. Claim 15 has been amended to add "a" before "processing system" to provide the antecedent basis. Claims 19-20 have been amended to depend from claim 13. Claims 21 and 22 properly depend from claim 20 and 21 respectively. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested. Claims 15 and 19-22 are therefore in condition for allowance.

Claims 13 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,549,288 ("*Migdal*"). *Migdal* is generally directed to a three dimensional digitizing system configured to obtain a three dimensional profile of an object. The system illuminates an object with a special kind of structured light pattern and records the shape of the reflected points of light by means of an image collector. However, *Migdal* does not teach or disclose: a first light source positioned in a first location and configured to emit a first signal along a first optical path oriented at a first acute angle relative to a substrate holder disposed in a processing system; or a second light source positioned in a second location different from the first location and configured to emit a second signal along a second optical path oriented at a second acute angle relative to the substrate holder. In fact, *Migdal* mentions nothing about a substrate holder. Accordingly, claim 13 is patentable over *Migdal*. Claim 17 is also patentable over *Migdal* because it depends from claim 13.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the claimed method or apparatus. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Ari Pramudji

Registration No. 45,022

MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.

3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500

Houston, TX 77056

Telephone: (713) 623-4844

Facsimile: (713) 623-4846

Attorney for Applicant(s)